



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/841,653 | 04/24/2001 | Yervant D. Lepejian | heur-018 | 6432 |
| 28661 | 7590 | 06/24/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD. P O BOX 6149 STATELINE, NV 89449 | | | PAN, DANIEL H | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2183 | 5 | |
| DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/841,653 | LEPEJIAN ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Daniel Pan | 2183 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3,5-12,14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (b) as being anticipated by Aoki et al. (5,892,948).

3. As to claims 1, 11, Aoki disclosed a graphic presentation system (e.g. see fig.10) at least :

a) a display graphics [icons] generated from data file (see the data file presented by icon in col.9, lines 50-56), detect a user indicated selection (see the click of a mouse in col.8, lines 34-50) from the display graphics (see fig.10, see also fig.6 for background teaching), read information from branch processing included in the data file (see the object), and perform a branch processing based on the user selection [click] (see col.10, lines 26-40, see also col.10, lines 63-67, col.11, lines 1-28 for the branching icon and corresponding processing).

4. As to claims 2,3,12, Aoki also included a pointing device , mouse (see col.8, lines 36-55). Mouse had been known to be a pointing device to a given position in the display, therefore, it had the coordinate information.

5. As to claim 5, 14, Aoki's branch processing was also executable program (see the execute function).
6. As to claims 6, 9,15, 18, Aoki also included a plurality of selectable branches or workflows (see the adjacent branches in fig.10, see selection by clicking the mouse in col.8, lines 27-55).
7. As to claims 7, 16, Aoki also included workflow information (see the icons arrayed in right to left and top to bottom in col.9, lines 65-67, col.10, lines 1-4).
8. As to claims 8,17, Aoki also included executable names [a-e], and work flow names [A-B processes] and execution parameters [branching icons] (see the objects a-e in col.11, lines 6-28).
9. As to claims 10,19, Aoki's workflow (e.g. process A) also included the correlated executable name [a][c] and executable parameter [branching icon] (see col.11, lines 6-28).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4 , 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (5,892,948) in view of Kaiser et al. (5,448,561) .
11. As to claims 4, 13, Aoki did not specifically show the structure of the data file , such as the header and data portion as claimed. However, Kaiser taught a data file

including header and data portions (see fig.3, col.5, lines 30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Kaiser in Aoki for using the header and data portion as claimed because the use of Kaiser could provide the control capability of Aoki to accept data file based on the specific identification information, such as the header, in an embedded format, thereby increasing the integration of the file type in a system, and because Aoki also taught that his program, data, and the directory were handled by objects, and because it had already been a common knowledge in the object oriented language that a data file must have a header and the data portion (secondary reference Kaiser already showed it), one of ordinary skill in the art should be able to recognize the applicability of the header and data portions in Aoki, and in doing so, provided a motivation.

12. Claims 20-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (b) as being anticipated by Oppenheim (5,734,905).

13. As to claim 20, Oppenheim disclosed a user interactive system including at least :

- a) data portion having graphics data displayable on computer display (e.g. see figs.2,3, see the object file associating with the image to be displayed in col.3, lines 35-39, see also the user definable data in the data body 163 in col.5, lines 15-17);
- b) a header portion having branch processing information including identification of a process option (see the menu selection in the header of the object file displayed in

fig.3, see each options as the identifications) to be executed after the user indicated selection from the displayed graphics [182][180] generated from the graphic data (see how the user selected the object by the mouse selection in col.6, lines 6-27).

The language "branch" is read in view of the specification as the activation point of a process or option (see applicant's clicking of a process option in the last page of the detailed description).

14. As to claim 21, Oppenheim also included a plurality of branches (see the pull down menu for different selections and the transform objects in fig.3).

15. As to claim 22, Oppenheim's plurality of processes were also executable because it was a transformation process executable on the object (e.g. see col.6, lines 56-67).

16. As to claim 23, Oppenheim also included executable name [object], workflow name [transformation process], execution parameters (see the parameters in col.6, lines 35-67, in col.8, lines 9-22).

17. As to claims 24, 41, Oppenheim taught at least :

- a) displaying graphics generated from data included in a data file (e.g. see fig.2, and fig.3, see col.3, lines 34-41);
- b) detecting a user indicated selection from the displayed graphics (see the clicking onto the object in fig.3, see col.6, lines 6-26);

c) reading information of branch processing according to the user's selection (see the begin transformation process in col.6, lines 27-40, col.8, lines 7-36 for more linked transformation processes).

18. The language "branch" is read in view of the specification as the activation point of a process or option (see applicant's clicking of a process option in the last page of the detailed description).

19. As to claims 25,26,27, Oppenheim also included the coordinate control because it included a pointing device, such as mouse, pointing to the position on the display (see col.6, lines 15-24). Mouse had been known to be a pointing device to a given position in the display, therefore, it had the coordinate information. Oppenheim's object was also an area on the display (see fig.3).

20. As to claim 28, Oppenheim's coordinate control (the mouse) must indicated an image because it is pointing to an object on the display.

21. As to claim 29, Oppenheim also included data portion [[Object Body 163] and header portion [162] (see fig.2, see the pointer ,Ptr, for the branch processing).

22. As to claim 30, Oppenheim also included executable program after the selection (see col.6, lines 6-67, see also col.8, lines 7-22 for the transformation process after the selection).

23. As to claim 31, Oppenheim also included executable name [object], workflow name [transformation process], execution parameters (see the parameters in col.6, lines 35-67, in col.8, lines 9-22).

24. As to claim 32, Oppenheim also included plurality of executable programs organized into branches individually selectable (see the menu of the transform processes in fig.7, col.8, lines 7-22, see also col.7, lines 21-26 for the user's selection).

25. As to claims 33, Oppenheim also included information for workflow after the selection (see the transformation options and the linking process in col.8, lines 7-36).

26. As to claims 34, 36, Oppenheim also included executable name [object], workflow name [transformation process], and executable parameters [linking information] (e.g. col.8, lines 23-36). Claim 34 is believed to be dependent from claim

24. Applicant is suggested to provide correction in the next response.

27. As to claim 35, Oppenheim also included plurality of workflows organized into branches individually selectable by user (see the transformations performed on the linked objects in col.8, lines 23-36, see the col.8, lines 7-22 for the menu selections).

28. As to claim 37, Oppenheim also included reading of the header information (see fig.2 [620]).

29. As to claims 38-40, Oppenheim also included image on the display (see fig.3). As to the chart in the display, Oppenheim's objects [182][180] are a chart. No specific feature or format of the chart is being recited in the claim, therefore, it is interpreted as any chart.

30. As to claim 42, Oppenheim also included selection of a first process, and selection of a second process (see the selections on many different transformation processes in the menu options in col.8, lines 15-22).

31. As to claim 43, Oppenheim also included a process branch [transformation] on a process option [the portion or the parameter of the object] according to the coordinate information [mouse] (see col.8, lines 7-22).

32. As to claim 44, Oppenheim also included :

- a) displaying a menu of plurality of process options (see col.8, lines 1-22);
- b) detecting user 's selection option form the menu (see col.8, lines 1-22);
- c) execution of the selected process according to the coordinate information (see the mouse pointing device on the display in col.6, lines 7-27, see the execution of the transform process in col.6, lines 55-60, col.8, lines 44-60).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) Palmer (6,029,257) is cited for the teaching of the displayable objects and header (e.g. see 5, lines 6-46).

- b) Sass (5,966,717) is cited for the teaching of the data file including the header portion and data portion (e.g. col.3, lines 45-54).
- c) Pruitt (6,179,490) is cited for the background teaching of the logical flow diagram including icons displayable on the computer screen (e.g. see col.2, lines 28-37).
- d) Carter is cited for the teaching of workflows representations on the display (e.g. see fig.5).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Pan whose telephone number is 703 305 9696. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chan, can be reached on 703 305 9712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

21 Century Strategic Plan

DANIEL H. PAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 10

Application/Control Number: 09/841,653
Art Unit: 2183

Page 10